

properly entered. See Press–Enterprise Co. v. Superior Ct. of Ca., 464 U.S. 501, 510 (1984); LCvR 6.1. When addressing motions to seal, the Court must consider alternatives to sealing and specify whether the sealing is temporary or permanent and also may redact such orders in its discretion. LCvR 6.1.


Pro se Plaintiff filed this civil rights suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C § 1983. The Complaint passed initial review on several claims including the use of excessive force. (Doc. No. 64). Defendants Branch, Cloniger, Hughes, Long, and Whitlock have now filed a Motion for Summary Judgment that is supported by exhibits including body camera and video camera footage that has been filed with the Court on a CD. The moving Defendants argue that it is inappropriate to disclose the footage to the public for safety and security reasons and pursuant to the Protective Order in this case. (Doc. No. 89 at 1); see (Doc. No. 79). Defendants Flitt and Carter consent to this Motion and the *pro se* Plaintiff has not been consulted. (Id. at 2).

The Court has considered alternatives to sealing and finds that compelling safety concerns override the public’s right to an open court in this case and warrant permanently sealing the Exhibits at issue. The moving Defendants’ Motion will be granted for the reasons set forth in the Motion and the Clerk of Court will be directed to seal Exhibits 1-B, 1-D-1 and 1-D-2 (Doc. Nos. 88-3, 88-5, and 88-6).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Defendants Branch, Cloniger, Hughes, Long, and Whitlock’s Motion to Seal Exhibits, (Doc. No. 89), is **GRANTED**.
2. The Clerk of Court is respectfully instructed to seal Exhibits 1-B, 1-D-1 and 1-D-2 to Defendants Branch, Cloniger, Hughes, Long, and Whitlock’s Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. Nos. 88-3, 88-5, and 88-6).

Signed: July 22, 2019


Frank D. Whitney
Chief United States District Judge

